

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended, and claims 5-7 and 13-15 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 8-12, 16 and 17 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 2 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,977,958 to Hinman et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,634 to Dykstra et al. Claims 3, 4, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinman et al. in view of Dykstra et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,206,779 to Sato et al. Claims 5 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinman et al. in view of Dykstra et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0031016 to Seagraves. Claims 6-9 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinman et al. in view of Dykstra et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,136,455 to Billingsley. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Among the limitations of independent claims 1 and 10 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art of record is a transceiving filter which includes:

a first directional circuit having a first double stage 90° hybrid circuit, "the first double stage 90° hybrid circuit including two reception filters having similar respective characteristics that allow a signal in a receive frequency band to pass," and

a second directional circuit having a second double stage 90° hybrid circuit, "the second double stage 90° hybrid circuit including two reception filters having similar

respective characteristics that allow the signal in the receive frequency band to pass.”

Neither Hinman et al., Dykstra et al., Sato et al., Seagraves nor Billingsley, either alone or combined, teach or suggest the use of a first and a second double-stage hybrid circuit, wherein each of the first and second double-stage hybrid circuits include “two reception filters having similar respective characteristics that allow the signal in the receive frequency band to pass” as required by independent claims 1 and 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 10 patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Claims 2-4, 8 and 9 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and include all of the limitations found therein. Claims 11, 12, 16 and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 10 and include all of the limitations found therein. Each of these dependent claims include additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are likewise patentable.

In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration of the amendments to claims 1 and 10, and allowance of the present application with claims 1-4, 8-12, 16 and 17 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Dated: March 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Richard LaCava/
Richard LaCava

Registration No.: 41,135
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant